Jun/21/109 11 6/11/23

B.G pinath, Flat 301, Saralaramam Apts, 16-11,310-8, Salimnagar, Hyderabad-500036.

PH: 91-40-24553602.

india.

FAX.NO. 703.872.9302. USPTO. Alexandria.

Date: June 21st 2003

Application no.	Filing date	Inventor
10 / 042,433	Jan10th 2002	Gopinath.B.

## Dear Mr. Druan, Jr,

I tried to contact you by phone twice on Friday, but did not succeed.

I am giving below a modified claim no 1 "draft" (refer to my fax d. 18<sup>th</sup> for the earlier draft). I request you to see if it is in order.

- Is it possible to reply by fax to the fax.no. 91.40.24559812 ?.
- Alternately reply may be sent to my email...baddepudi@rediffinail.com.
- A simple reply of OK or not OK will do without discussing any details.

I feel the new draft is better than the one I sent on 18th june.

## Draft Claim no.1.

- 1. A multi knife cutting device comprising:
  - Five embodiments having common features of multiple knives as cutting means functioning in combination with slotted guide frames cum base structures,
  - concurrently having distinctive structural features in each embodiment which facilitate characteristic methods of cutting.

Draft dependent claim 2.

2. A multi knife cutting device according to claim 1, wherein the first embodiment is device A comprising: ----- details of structure of device A will be given in dependent claim 2 and similarly for other devices B.C.D in dependent claims which will include distinctive features.

yourtraly,

Received from < > at 6/21/03 2:19:52 AM [Eastern Daylight Time]

FAX RECEIVED
JUN 2 1 2003

**GROUP 3700** 

Fax. No. 703,872,9302. USA
From, B. Gopinath. Hyd rabad. India. Application no.10/042,

Application no.10/042,433. Filing dateJan 10th 2002.

June 18th 2003.

Dear Mr. Druan, I refer to your recent office action letter. Received on Tune Th.

 I noted your advice on Claim 1 on page3 of your recent office action, "Claim 1 to read simply, A multi knife cutting device comprising: ".

• This wording will violate the rule---the claim must positively claim a single device.

 The word multi knife cutting device is actually not one device but a common designation for five devices all of which are multi knife devices but with different structural configuration.

I am in a dilemma. I will telephone you after two days so that you will have time to read

this, to seek your advice.

Is the following draft OK for claim 1 to be followed by dependent claims?.

 My reply is ready with regard to the claim rejection. I will send it once the above is clarified.

Yours truly, Gopinath.B.

rs & La

## CLAIMS.

I claim:

1. A multi knife cutting device, which has five embodiments, having a common function of cutting vegetables, and common features of multiple knives combined with a slotted platform frame cum base, and at the same time each device having it's own other unique structural features facilitating different methods of cutting with it's own characteristics, namely:

Device A comprising, a base having a vegetable support platform, and a multiple knife assembly in a frame, both of which are connected by a telescopic guide having coil springs, and wherein the knife assembly moves vertically up or down,

Device B comprising, a slotted guide frame with an enclosed platform for vegetables, six knives mounted inside the guide frame slots using a fulcrum bolt and where in the knives

move on the fulcrum axis in an inclined fashion,

Device B, Variation, comprising a structural base frame on which six knives are
mounted in a fixed manner so that they can support the vegetables on the edge, Seven U shaped
guides mounted in the late treatment the guides unique a fulcrum half passing through the all the
knives at one end and wherein the guides connected to a handle move on the fulcrum axis in an
inclined action and pass through the knives and wherein the knives are stationary at the bottom
relative to the guides which are the moving parts,

Device C comprising, an assembly of six rotary knives mounted equidistant on a common handle, a slotted board with grooves on which the knives will roll, and a slotted end block through which the knives will pass to push back the cut pieces between the knives.

Device D comprising a slotted guide frame, knives mounted in slots similar to device B, the knives moving on fulcrum axis with inclined cutting action, but having bigger knives and independent knife handles to be able to slice whole potatoes and to be able to flexibly combine the knives based on the size of the vegetable to be cut.

5 Dependant claims will follow giving further details of the structures with their unique features.

**FAX RECEIVED** 

JUN 1 8 2003

**GROUP 3700**